

GERMANY PREPARES FOR WAR

The Case Against Germany

**TWO LECTURES
by
ERIC MANN**

DISTRIBUTED BY
SOCIETY PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III, Inc.
515 Madison Avenue
New York 22, N. Y.

September 1944
THE ADVERTISERS PRESS
DES MOINES, IOWA



A few days after I had delivered an address on "Germany and World War No. III" for the Kiwanis Club in Des Moines, Iowa, on August 9, I received a letter from Mr. George S. Murphy of the same city, stating that my talk had impressed him very much and that he wanted to bring the information it contained to as many politicians, educators, commentators and newspapermen as he could. He offered to print gratis several thousand pamphlets containing the important points in my address.

I gratefully accepted Mr. Murphy's generous offer. Thousands of copies of this pamphlet are being sent to thousands of people. Furthermore, lecturing throughout the country, I have been asked very often whether I could furnish copies of my speech.

I am a speaker, not a writer; therefore I simply dictated my lectures to Miss Miller.

ERIC MANN
New York, N. Y.
August, 1944.

THE AUTHOR

Into the 42 years of his life Eric Mann has packed enough colorful experience to last most people for three or four lifetimes. As a boy he watched the collapse of the old Austrian Empire in his home town, Vienna. He first came to the United States in 1926 and is a naturalized American citizen.

Dr. Mann has found time to travel in most countries of the world, taking thousands of feet of movie film and some ten thousand photographs. So he turned to the lecture platform. He brought the culture of foreign countries to American audiences.

With the rise of Fascism in Europe he began lecturing upon political subjects, especially upon the German problem to which he has devoted many years of study. He is regarded as an authority on Central European affairs.

Dr. Mann was in Poland when the Germans invaded that country. He predicted the attack upon Pearl Harbor weeks before it took place. In the fall of 1939 he predicted Germany's attack upon the Scandinavian peninsula. Returning from a visit in Russia in 1939 he predicted that Russia would fight.

Dr. Mann is a member of the American Academy of Social and Political Science and a director of the Society for the Prevention of World War III. His discussion of Germany and what will happen in Central Europe after her defeat has fascinated many audiences from coast to coast.

He was employed as teacher of history and German in Army Specialist Training Program at Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa, during the last school year. During this time and right after it Dr. Mann delivered 130 lectures in Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Illinois, Michigan, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, Texas and Mexico.

Germany Prepares for War

The most important problem in the world today is no longer the winning of this war because we know that we are going to win it—it is practically all over except for the fighting. The more important problem is to make certain that our military victory will be followed by a political victory, in other words, to win the peace. In order to achieve this end it is necessary to adjust our own mentality to a world torn and reborn by suffering and wars, and to understand the mentality of our enemies, because they will remain our enemies for a long time after the declaration of peace.

A German Surrender?

It is my conviction that the German military will offer to surrender only with foreign soldiers on German soil. Wars and defeats in foreign countries have always, throughout German history, had the air of unreality for the Germans, and not even the most terrific bombardments from the air can bring home to the German people the fact that they are in a war which they are just about to lose, as effectively as can foreign soldiers on German soil. To Germans the uniform has been for centuries a sign of civilization, the one thing to be admired, the great ideal to be worshipped. But once the Germans shall have been taught that other nations also have this kind of civilization if they have to, once the Germans shall be made to realize that men in the uniforms of other nations can even beat men in German uniforms, then perhaps it may dawn in German heads.

With foreign soldiers invading Germany proper, there might likely come an offer to surrender from the German military leaders. They will come to us and say: "We love the Americans, we admire the British and we are simply crazy about the Russians." They will tell us that it was all a mistake and if we would just do this and this and that, and if we would promise not to do this and this and that, they would be only too happy to surrender unconditionally. They will promise to take care of the Nazi party, to deliver, if we want to, Mr. Hitler, Goerings, Goebbels, Himmler, Ribbentrop and all the other members of this unholy society to us on a silver plate; to withdraw German troops from all occupied countries; to release immediately all foreign soldiers and workers within Germany; and to set up a new government along democratic lines. All this they would do if we would not completely occupy and govern Germany. Should we not accept this beautiful offer the alternative would be chaos. By this threat the German military will hope to frighten us into accepting terms which would give the German military a chance of survival and thus the possibility of renewing their bid for world conquest twenty or thirty years from now.

Whenever we are faced with a situation such as this it is always well to go back in history, to see whether we can learn something from mistakes made previously, whether or not a similar situation had existed before. I realize that there are many who say: "You never learn anything from history!" But then you never learn anything from a chart and you never learn anything from a time-table. Of course you don't if you do not look at it. But if you do you'll be surprised to see that history provides many, many clues to the solution of today's problems.

In this case we do not even have to go back very far, all we have to do is to go back to 1918. In 1918 we had a surrender!

For many years we have been told that strikes occurred in Hamburg and Kiel in 1918, that these strikes swept all over the country, that they broke the German homefront, and, of course, with the homefront in shreds, the German armies had to give up. So we have been led to believe that the German armies had been victorious to the very end and that some Socialists or Communists, or heaven knows what kind of "ists" had stabbed the German Reichswehr in the back. But history presents another picture altogether.

Weeks before the so-called German surrender occurred, Mr. Hindenburg and Mr. Ludendorff, virtual dictators of Germany at that time, called into conference Mr. Frederick Ebert (prominent Social Democratic leader) and Mr. Scheidemann, told them that the game was up, that after four years of fighting the German armies were beaten on the battlefields by French, British and American troops, but that in order to save the prestige of the military, to save what the Germans called the sacred honor of the uniform, some sort of revolution had to be construed in order to make it appear to the world and especially to the German people that it was the homefront and not the battlefield that had been broken. Social Democratic leader Mr. Ebert accepted this mission; he formed a new government with the permission of the defeated generals and thus took upon himself the blame not only for the war itself, but for having lost it. An agreement was signed by Ebert and Hindenburg according to which the Social Democrat Ebert pledged to leave whatever military there should be permitted in the new Germany in the very same hands in which it had always been—the hands of the Prusso-Junker generals: by so doing the Social Democrat Ebert saved German militarism.

There was no revolution in 1918. There was only a make-believe revolution; the "German Revolution" of 1918 consisted of nothing more than the running away of twenty-one princes and one imperial majesty, not one of which moved his little finger in order to save his throne. It is said that his imperial majesty, Wilhelm II, ran so fast when the first Allied shells exploded on German soil that he took only one pair of pants with him, which is just too bad, because I believe he had great need for a second one.

So the German Republic from its very inception became nothing but a smoke-screen behind which the very same reactionary forces which had always been in command in Germany not only continued to function, but were fostered by the very same man who had promised the world to destroy them.

By going to Versailles the Republican government of Germany took upon its shoulders the complete blame for what the Germans call a "slave treaty" and left the German military leaders the heroes of the country, the rallying points for the German desire for revenge.

Of course, after four years of fighting and starvation there were a small number of men and women in Germany dissatisfied with the regime, earnestly desiring a change. Those were killed. General Groener shot in cold blood fifteen to sixteen thousand German workers in the streets of Berlin, Hamburg and Leipzig, etc.

When I say that there was no revolution you do not have to take my word for it. You can take Scheidemann's word—the "leader" of the revolution and first Chancellor of the German Republic—and you can take General Groener's word, another "leader" of the revolution. During the famous trials in Munich in 1925, Groener declared: "Ebert and I fought the revolution," and Scheidemann declared: "I take the stand that there had been no revolution, we did not prepare for it nor did we want is."

It is, I believe, important to remember these things now because now we are faced with the very same situation—we will be confronted with a "revolutionary government" in Germany, headed by someone who will claim that he was never a Nazi. If this should happen we can learn a very valuable lesson from the happenings of 1918.

Versailles

There are those who claim that Versailles created Hitler, that Versailles was the source of all evils. This contention is brought forward mostly by those who are not hampered by any knowledge. I contend that Versailles came as a very agreeable surprise to the defeated Germans. What kind of treaty Germany expected becomes very apparent when we just take a little look upon the treaty imposed by victorious Germany upon a defeated enemy. I refer to the "forgotten treaty of Brest-Litovsk." Here are some of its provisions: Russia had to give up 500,000 square miles of territory inhabited by over sixty million people—one-third of her entire population. She lost 90% of her entire steel and iron industries and over 50% of all her other industries. There are other provisions, of course, but we can take the word of Professor Hazen of Columbia University when he declares that the treaty of Brest-Litovsk was the most cruel that was ever imposed by a civilized nation upon another civilized nation.

I readily admit that Versailles was not perfect; it contained errors, borderlines were not always drawn correctly, but the real weakness of Versailles was the fact that it was much too mild and was not enforced.

What were its main provisions? Germany lost Alsace-Lorraine. But those who claim that this was an injustice usually forget that Germany had taken Alsace-Lorraine from France about 50 years previously and they do not mention that the population of Alsace-Lorraine welcomed the French troops as liberators.

Germany lost her colonies, but the German government had always claimed that they not only did not derive any profits from those colonies, but had to support them financially. The taking of liabilities off one's hands cannot possibly work hardship.

Germany lost Eupen and Malmedy, Danzig was internationalized, certain rivers were placed under an international administration, but few ever mentioned these provisions; and then comes the question of disarmament. Germany was permitted to keep an army of 100,000 men, "only" 100,000 men and no tanks and no planes, to be sure. But those 100,000 men remained in the hands of the Junker generals and became the nucleus of the German army of today. I was in Germany in 1920 and 1921 and I and anybody with open eyes could see that Germany then did not have an army of 100,000 but of hundreds of thousands of men. Of course, they were not called soldiers, but Arbeitsbattallione (workingmen battallions). They were dressed in smartly tailored uniforms but carried no guns. They marched in military formations carrying shovels. But if anyone in Washington, London or Paris had just taken out a little time to look it was not difficult to discover that most of these shovels could shoot.

There are two more important provisions of the Versailles Treaty: the Polish Corridor and reparations. The first one of these never excited the Germans very much. Germans are not interested in the east; they are interested in the west, they are always ready to die for their Rhine. If somebody should ask: How about this "Drang Nach dem Osten?" Yes, there is this infamous desire to expand to the east, but by east the Germans mean southeast, in the direction of Baghdad, through the Ukraine where there is oil and coal and wheat which the Germans want. But it so happened that some of the Junkers had large estates in the strip of land which had to be given to Poland in order to give her access to the sea. And so they raised a big fuss about it talking about mistreated Germans in Poland, so that the Polish Corridor question became an inflated question excitedly discussed everywhere in the world. It is entirely beneficial to remember these things now because Poland will again demand and receive access to the sea.

Reparations

And now reparations: American economists have long disproved the German claim that reparations not only ruined Germany but distorted European economy. Let me just give you two figures. Germany actually paid 4,400 millions in reparations. This is not my figure, and it is not the official figure of the U. S. Government—it is the German figure. Included in this 4,400 millions which the Germans claim

to have paid are such little items as the fleet which the Germans scuttled at Scapa Flow instead of surrendering it, and the artillery which Germany lost retreating in France. But let us be generous and accept the German figure. During the time that Germany allegedly paid this amount she received loans from America, Britain, France and Switzerland to the amount of 6,700 million dollars of which sum up to this very date not one single cent was ever paid back. So Germany made a cash profit of 2,300 million dollars out of the last war and it should be very difficult to prove that a nation can be ruined by receiving such a gift. It sounds almost humorous when one mentions the fact that Germany included the interest paid on these loans in the 4,400 million dollars which she claims to have paid in reparations. And one year before Hitler took over, reparations were officially discontinued by action of the League of Nations in Geneva!

No, the last peace was certainly not lost at Versailles, it was lost in Germany. Our peacemakers eventually accepted the idea that a nation such as Germany can become a democracy just by promising to become one. It was perhaps believed that democracy was something comparable to a ready-made suit—a Bond suit, perhaps, with two pairs of pants, one constitution and one Bill of Rights, and all one has to do would be to put it on and it would fit. In vain did Clemenceau plead: The primary problem is that of security from German attack; only when this problem is solved would the establishment of democracy in Germany be possible! How could anyone believe that a nation such as Germany could so completely change over night; that a nation with a history such as Germany would be willing, let alone know how, to use democracy. Democracy is like a tool in the hands of man and those who do not know how to use it have to be taught. Democracy is something one has to plant very carefully, to grow very carefully! Democracy has the ability to change and it is one of its most beautiful features that it does have this ability. In a Germany in which nothing was changed, democracy had no chance. The German Republic of 1918 became a republic without republicans. Every single government that headed this republic had one aim: to cast off the "shackles of Versailles," to rearm, to take revenge. So disliked was the Republic that very soon after its inception the Germans changed the name "Deutsche Republic" (German Republic) back to Deutsches Reich. Deutsches Reich it was under the Kaiser, Deutsches Reich it was in the Republic and Deutsches Reich it is now under Schickelgruber. If any proof were needed of the German dislike of the Republican form of government it could be found in this fact: when the Germans for the very first time in their whole history had the opportunity to elect by democratic means their leader they elected an old defeated general because he was tall and had red stripes on his trousers. . . Hindenburg. Quoting one of his first campaign speeches Mr. Hindenburg—a man campaigning for the *presidency of a democratic republic*—said: "German people, I want you to know that I am a monarchist." This, of course, made a big hit in

Germany. Later on he declared that he had never read a book except military ones. After this profound statement his election was assured.

We lost the peace of 1918 because of lack of knowledge of German history, and as a consequence of this a complete misjudgment of German character.

What Does History Tell Us?

Americans especially have a somewhat distorted picture of German history. This goes back to the time of Frederick the Great and his father, because Americans have been taught that he was a great liberal, because he permitted his subjects to go to any church they pleased. That he was a great intellectual, because he courted Voltaire for a time. That he was in favor of the American Revolution, so much so, that he dispatched his own General Von Steuben to America in order to assist George Washington in his fight for independence. I am very sorry to be obliged to debunk this naive conception of the man. Frederick was no liberal. Certainly, he permitted you to go to any church you pleased, but only after he had closed those he did not like and exiled or executed priests who refused to obey his orders. He was no great intellectual, because he refused a position to the greatest genius of his time, Bach. He did not dispatch General von Steuben to America. On the contrary, General von Steuben was exiled by his own ungrateful king Frederick, living in dire poverty in Paris where he was discovered by the great Frenchman St. Germain. It was this true lover of liberty who provided money and weapons and a ship! General von Steuben arrived in America under the French flag with letters of introduction to George Washington written in the French language.

Frederick the Great was certainly not in favor of the American or any other revolution, but it so happened that at the time of the American Revolution he was at odds with England, and he indicated that anything was welcome that would do harm to Britain. He was no liberal by his own admission. Shortly before his death he said: "I am tired of ruling over slaves." This Frederick the Great, who hardly used the German language—he spoke mostly French—who inherited from his father a well organized, rich country, which he himself left impoverished and disorganized, a man who fought wars for 22 consecutive years and finally gained a piece of Silesia at the price of one million dead, and whose much advertised greatest achievement, the invincible Prussian army was beaten by Napoleon a few years after his death, so decisively that there was nothing left of it, this tyrannical king, who broke every single treaty that Prussia had ever signed, who is responsible for one of the blackest crimes in history, the partitioning of Poland—(Catherine of Prussia also took a part, but she was German and Maria Theresa of Austria also did, but at least she cried when she took it)—this ruler who wrote a little pamphlet called "On German Intellect" in which he was at pains to declare that only the British knew something about world trade, only the Italians understand music and

only the French practiced the grace of living, and that the Germans were only good to be "cannon fodder" (this word is his invention), a man who personally led the most immoral life any man could lead, he is today regarded the patron saint of anything German. I am afraid the Germans do not realize how well he does represent them.

During the time of Napoleon it was Prussia that sold out German states to the French. When Napoleon demanded to meet the beautiful Prussian queen at Tilsit in Prussia—alone, she came. Only after Prussia was absolutely sure that the great armies of Russia and Austria would rally to her aid did she begin to organize a war of liberation against Napoleon.

And then came Bismarck who is regarded by many as the unifier of Germany, but he was nothing of that kind. He destroyed Germany by arms and treachery. He, the Prussian, conquered several of the German states and incorporated them into Prussia. He was and he wanted to be Prussian. In his own Memoirs he says that it was the destiny of Prussia to absorb Germany. Three wars he fought for the greater glory of Prussianized Germany. "Blood and Iron" was his policy.

And then William II. He had to have the biggest army and the greatest navy and his idea of humanity was "There are no human beings below a lieutenant."

First President Ebert saved German Militarism and Hindenburg made of Germany a monarchistic republic with the enthusiastic approval of the German people. In vain do we look in our history books for the great German revolution. There is nothing comparable to the French, the American, the Russian Revolution. The German people prefer order to liberty and have always with enthusiasm followed leaders into wars.

And finally Hitler. He is not the result of Versailles, not the result of the neglect on the part of the First World War allies to support the "Democratic Republic" in Germany, but a logical consequence of 150 or 200 years German education, desires, aspirations.

Men Are Created Equal!

The fact is that German philosophy is not based upon those who have proclaimed peace and equality of men, but it is based upon the teachings of those philosophers who have proclaimed the superiority of the state over the individual, and the superiority of Germans over other nations. We, in America, most certainly believe in the doctrine that men are created equal. Therefore, a child born in Berlin is just as good as a child born in Chicago. But when this child in Chicago begins to think and talk, then it is made into a civilian, and it is told over and over again what rights it has as an American citizen. The child in Berlin when it begins to think and talk is made into a military creature, a soldier, and it is hammered into his head what duties it

has towards the German state. Anyone who knows Germany will remember newspapers carrying notices of the birth of children and very often one could read: "Mr and Mrs. XY announce the birth of a boy, another soldier for the Kaiser," or more recently "for der Fuhrer."

What They Teach!

For outside consumption Bach and Beethoven, Goethe and Lessing, Ehrlich and Holbein were used to spread the fame of the German intellect. For domestic consumption the heroes were not these great minds but men like Bismarck and Frederick the Great, like Clausewitz and Hindenburg, men who had sacrificed lives, had spilled blood, had fought wars "the noblest manifestation of men."

I should like to give you a few quotations from men who have greatly influenced German thinking of today. Not the well known philosophers Fichte, Hegel and the incredible Nietzsche, who saw the chaos coming and instead of trying to prevent it, greeted it with joy, but of men whose ideas live with every German today. Frederick the Great, for instance, proclaimed:

"Take what you can, you are never wrong unless you are compelled to give it back."

Or Mr. Alfred Rosenberg, the "great" philosopher of Nazism—if Nazism can be called a philosophy—who declared in 1937:

"The new Europe will be a realm restored to barbarism."

Or General Haeseler! In 1893 he had this to say:

"It is necessary that our civilization shall build temples on heaps of corpses."

Certainly the Germans have lived up to his teachings.

In 1911 the Pan-German writer Tannenberg declared:

"War must leave nothing to the vanquished, but their eyes to weep with."

In 1913, the famous German military philosopher, General Bernhardt gave his people this advice:

"Our people must learn that the preservation of peace cannot and must not be our policy."

And Hitler took Bernhardt's words right out of his book and in his catechism for barbarism known as "Mein Kampf," he declares:

"In eternal peace mankind will perish. Preservation of peace is a general disease of political thought."

The world remained completely silent when the Nazis openly boasted: We are a nation without civilians.

Let me finish these quotations with one by the famous, or should I say infamous General Haushofer, the man to whom is credited the inventing of Geo-Politics. Geo-Politics, well, lecturers, professors, commentators and columnists try to explain what geo-politics is. To me, it is first of all the sum total of all the activities which would win for you a peace if you should happen to lose the war. Mr. Haushofer very modestly declared in 1936:

"The German Reich will direct the destinies of the world; it must rule the lives of all nations and all individuals."

The Program

These are the ideas which have been fed to the Germans and eagerly eaten up by them. These are the ideas contained in Hitler's book. Everyone in Germany that could read had read "Mein Kampf" and seventeen and a half million Germans voted Hitler leader of the strongest party in Germany, thus giving direct approval to his program.

It is an old program; Hitler did not invent it, it was invented long before Mrs. Schickelgruber moved to Braunau on the German-Austrian frontier. Hitler simply publicized what had been long the desire of the German people. Wars for conquest had been on the program for every German leader; it is not as some students, and some who claim to be students, believe, a matter of picking bad leaders, but a deliberate picking of those leaders who promise to fulfill pan-German ambitions.

The Middle Class — Here and in Germany

It is not easy to describe German character because it is not harmonious. Germans are forever looking for something else. They are always desirous of having something which they do not yet have. As Mr. Ludwig points out in his book "How to Treat the Germans," the Germans themselves have a very good word for it; Er fuehlt sich nicht wohl in seiner Haut! (He does not feel comfortable in his own skin.) And since he does not, a uniform helps a great deal to overcome his uncertainty. Germany, like America, is a country of the middle-class. Here in America people are very proud of what their fathers did, are proud of the fact that they came here poor with nothing but their hands and the will to work. Americans are proud to be the descendants of pioneers and in many respects they still are pioneers. Americans are happy and proud that their standards were raised. The German middle class on the other hand, descends from the privileged classes who had lost most of their privileges.

When you go looking for a room in New York the landlady will show it to you, will quote you a price, and expect you to say yes or no. In Germany if you look for a room, the landlady will ask you to sit down and tell you that her father used to be a captain or a major and that she had lost everything and how low she had sunk socially that she now has to rent rooms.

Considering these facts, one can perhaps understand the readiness of Germans to follow leaders who would promise conquests, honor, titles, privileges.

The Generals and Their Preparations

The German Junker generals have long understood this state of affairs, and they have used the willing German masses to go step by step forward on the road to world domination. They understand, of

course, that world, or even continental, conquest is not a matter of one war to be fought successfully within a few years, but a matter of many wars to be fought at intervals, but with continuously greater success. They understand, also, and perhaps better than anybody else, that only long and very meticulous preparations can assure success to a fair degree.

When Germany defeated France in 1871, and Bismarck proclaimed the German Empire in the Mirror Hall of Versailles, the Germans understood two things; first, that they had been very successful in creating a great empire and powerful military machine, thus having completed their first task, and secondly, that they were now at the beginning of their second task, the conquest of Europe. While Prussian officers were still shouting themselves hoarse at Versailles the German military leaders began to lay the groundwork for the war which they started in 1914. In 1870 and '71 they had been very successful; in 1914-18 they had been much more successful. Before the ink dried on the Treaty of Versailles the German military were busy preparing for World War No. 2. Unfortunately the world was not very much interested in General Foch's remark made on November 11, 1918: "Let the armies stand at ease; we are now going to have an armistice for twenty years." And when General Pershing wanted to go on to Berlin, and fought against the idea of non-occupation, he was called a barbarian. Especially in Germany headlines appeared to this effect: The "American barbarian" did not yet have enough of the slaughter and wants to go on. Little did the world realize then that this American barbarian was the only Allied general, besides Foch, who really did understand the issue.

The World Asleep

But the most amazing thing is that nothing that Germany did after 1918 seemed to open the eyes of the world to the inescapable truth. The election of Hindenburg, the fuss raised about the Polish Corridor, the training of thousands of men in Germany with wooden tanks and paper machine-guns, the idea of "revenge for Versailles" taught in every school, shouted from every stage, and aired over every radio, the tremendous propaganda campaign for the "good, defeated Germans who were carrying on against overwhelming odds," the lie of the Allies refusal to help the young German Republic, and finally the advent of Hitler, nothing made the world realize the immediate danger.

When Germans under Hitler command began to kill Jews and Catholics, when they reoccupied territories, when they introduced conscription and openly stuck to the program as proclaimed in "Mein Kampf" there was, to the eternal shame of mankind, not one government in the world courageous enough to break with such outlaws, there was, to the eternal shame of mankind, not one single people in the world awake enough to demand such a break. On the contrary, the ambassadors and other representatives of this gangster regime were present

in every capital in the world. The Nazi ambassador went in and out of the State Department in Washington, Mr. Ribbentrop, the Nazi ambassador at the Court of St. James, gave the Nazi salute right into the face of the King of England. Trade agreements were signed between the German thieves, and dozens of other governments. And even after Hitler had taken Austria and Czechoslovakia, there was not one government and there was not one people that would demand action. Not one of the United Nations entered the war voluntarily, that is, without being directly attacked, none, except Great Britain and her ally France. And while Poland was destroyed, and while Britain was blitzed, all the United Nations continued to do business with Hitler and his gang. Only because they were attacked did they become belligerents. Those who were not attacked, like Sweden, Turkey, Spain are still helping Germany and are curtailing this help only now in the face of an overwhelming German defeat. I don't know whether Holland would have gone to war without German armies crossing her frontiers; I don't know what Yugoslavia and Greece and Belgium and Norway would have done without being attacked. And I shudder to think what would have become of the world without the German attack upon Russia and the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor.

These facts do in no way diminish Germany's guilt. I mention them just to illustrate that there was no unity in Europe and this, of course, worked in Hitler's favor. We hope that there will be unity after this war, and we are making all efforts in this direction. But since we cannot be sure whether we really will be able to achieve European unity, we must deal with Germany in such fashion as to make it impossible for her to attack even though there would be disunity among the nations of the world later on. The recipe "hope for the best and prepare for the worst" is still good.

Germany Prepares for War

As I have previously pointed out Germany began preparations for World War I in 1871, she began preparations for World War II in 1918 and she has already begun preparations for World War III. We can divide German activities in this direction into three groups:

1. Domestic preparations.
2. Preparations in the countries dominated by Germany.
3. Preparations in the rest of the world.

I. Domestic preparations can be divided into two sections.

a. Population Policies

It is estimated that Germany today has between two and two and a quarter million more boys between the ages of eight months and four years than the number of soldiers which she lost in this war. This has come about through the German government-sponsored increase in legitimate as well as illegitimate births. It is the duty of every German girl capable of having a baby to have one. It is the

duty of every soldier who goes to the front "to die for the Fuehrer" to beget a child before he leaves. The German state does not make any difference between children born in or out of wedlock, but when we reestablish Christian principles in Germany these illegitimate children very likely will acquire an inferiority complex which in turn will make them want to don a uniform and become children of the state in the full sense of the word.

There are breeding homes in Germany where thousands of women are being held for the express purpose of bringing children into the world; they are being mated at regular intervals with young Germans who have been exempted from military service and who have no other profession. There are, as is well known, a number of Ordensburgen, schools to train the future leaders of the Nazi party. Next to every one of them, one can find a B. D. M. camp (Bund of German girls) who have to be at the disposal of these "students." Mr. Himmler has stated very clearly: "Contrary to the bourgeois code of law and morals it is a noble role for unmarried German girls to become the mothers of our future front-line soldiers." General Krug, the organizer of this population policy has stated: "Children belong to the nation. Parents and teachers are merely trustees for the nation."

b. The new Terror of Europe: Nazi Underground

Hitler has implied several times that the Nazis will go on fighting even after their defeat. In Germany there is under way a great training program for the future underground Nazi movement, not only for Germany, but for the other European countries as well. Under the direction of Gestapo chief Himmler a careful study has been made of all the underground methods used by the Nazi-occupied countries. Forty thousand young Germans are being trained in a school near Stuttgart in these methods. They learn everything from committing acts of sabotage to giving lectures, and of course in committing murder. These forty thousand men will be assisted by another group of about twenty-five thousand selected trustworthy Nazis who are being trained in the ideologies of the former political parties such as Social Democrats, the Communists, the Catholic Zentrum. They will claim that they have been true to their political faith throughout the time of the Nazi regime. They will demand to be placed in key positions in the reorganization of Germany.

The Nazis have sent thousands of their most ardent followers into German concentration camps. They figured that anyone whom Hitler puts into a concentration camp for political reasons would certainly be regarded as our friend and released immediately upon Allied occupation; thus released they would be safe. He could continue his Nazi activities right under the eyes of our armies.

Sixty thousand girls, picked for their looks, are being taught English, Russian as well as the art of love making. They are to undermine the morale as well as the morals of the armies of occupation.

Headquarters for this huge underground organization have been established in Munich and Stockholm. The German Embassy in the Swedish capitol employs five hundred men and women which of course is out of all proportion.

This whole program which is under the direction of Gestapo chief Himmler and Mr. Kaltenbrunner, an Austrian criminal, is designed not only to make the occupation of Germany as difficult as possible, but "to harass the German people, to undermine any future government, to keep the population of Germany and other European countries in a state of despair."

II. Preparations in the countries which were or are still occupied by Germany follow the old familiar pattern prescribed by Frederick the Great: "Weaken the enemy by every possible means so that he never again can become a threat to you." The Germans have followed this advice by physically destroying the intelligentsia, that is, all those who are potential leaders. They have closed schools, universities in Poland and Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and even in France. They have taken thousands of women from Norway, Holland, Belgium, Poland, Czechoslovakia, etc., placed them into brothels for the German army and sent them back home sick and without medical care. They have undermined the morals in for instance, Poland, by distributing pornographic literature among the Polish youth and by selling cheap alcohol for as little as twenty-five cents a pint, but charging up to two dollars for a loaf of bread. In this way Germany wants to make sure that whatever should be done for these countries in the way of rehabilitation they will be so weak that Germany will remain the strongest power in Europe even after defeat. The task of rebuilding these countries will be so gigantic that not only will Germany have nothing to fear from them for a long time, but the Allies will have to divert much of their attention and energies towards this end.

III. Preparations in the rest of the world consist of a gigantic propaganda campaign everywhere. It is interesting to see that groups as well as individuals imbued with the idea of Germanism become the more outspoken the nearer the end of Hitler Germany looms. Just as after 1918, we are flooded with a deluge of books, papers, articles and radio programs telling us that only a handful of Nazis are to blame, that the German people have just been misled, that it is in the interest of world peace to give Germany another chance at democracy, and to persuade us that the most important task will be not the reconstruction of territories devastated by Germany, but the reconstruction of Germany itself. Committees are being formed to facilitate the creation of a democratic Germany which they claim only Germans are able to create. The interesting point concerning all these efforts is that most of them completely leave out of their discussions the incredible crimes committed by millions of Germans in the army, the S. S., the Gestapo, the civilian population.

How can anyone declare the German people innocent? Is it possible that a nation of 72 million could prepare for war for years and then fight a war, and very successfully until recently, without the will to do so? Is it possible that a nation can put thousands of planes into the air and thousands of tanks and millions of men into the field without the support of the whole nation? Is it conceivable that 72 million people could go on living under war conditions for years and at the same time keep their factories going at full blast to produce the implements of war, without the support of the whole nation? Can anyone believe that a people hostile to war would not have revolted? Most certainly the German people supported Hitler! One can hear very often: Oh, this or that crime, this or that murder was not committed by the Germans, it was committed by the Nazis. It was done by the S. S. or the Gestapo! But is the Gestapo or the S. S. NOT the German people? Is the Gestapo agent who kills and rapes not the son or the brother or the husband of the German baker, teacher, shoemaker, official? They are the German people. They did not fall from heaven! Just as the soldier or policeman in America represents a cross section of the American people, so the German Gestapo agent or soldier or S. S. man represents a cross section of the German people. Is the police in America NOT the American people? If not, who are they? And why should police in Germany not be regarded as the German people? The members of the "Volksgericht" (Peoples Court) that condemns "traitors" to death, are they not German? The gentlemen who turned on the furnaces in Lublin to burn the bodies of millions of murdered men, women and children, are they not the German people? Do they not go home after their bloody work is done and play with their children teaching them to Heil Hitler? Suppose Hitler should win, God forbid! Suppose he could keep all the promises made to the German people, suppose he could go on exploiting Europe, exterminating nations, suppose peace were to break out tomorrow morning—Hitler's peace! How many Germans would *then* rebel against him? How many Germans would demand that Poland be reestablished, the loot taken from France be returned, that criminals who have killed Yugoslav children be brought to justice? How many women in Berlin would want to return to the rightful owner the fur coat which her husband stole in France? How many Germans would demand that plows be given to Czech farmers except to enable them to produce food for Germany? Not one! All Germany would elevate Hitler to the status of God himself.

Only now with the handwriting on the wall for all to see, now some might turn against Hitler, not because of what he has done but simply because he is no longer winning.

What Should We Do?

It is deplorable that the campaign for soft treatment of Germany is not only conducted by Germans, but by some Americans as well. They perhaps want to wrap themselves in an aura of very misplaced humanitarianism. How could it be possible that a German democracy that failed so utterly in 1918 could now succeed after eleven years of Hitlerism. The answer to all this pro-German propaganda must be that we, the United Nations, are interested in the establishment of a German democracy, that we do want to give it a chance, but that our first concern must be security from German attack. The problem is not just one of hanging a few hundred thousands even though I am afraid that will be necessary; the problem is to teach Germany and any other prospective aggressor that the decent world will always resist and ultimately destroy the aggressor.

An international organization to guard and guarantee peace is necessary and will probably be set up, but international organizations have the weakness that they can be and have been rendered ineffective. The treatment of Germany, therefore, must be such that even in the event that this international organization should fail, Germany would be prevented from putting the torch to the world once more. In our treatment of Germany we should be guided neither by lust for revenge nor by consideration of business. Security should be our first aim.

I offer for your consideration eight points which I think should form the basis of our program for the treatment of Germany.

1. UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER. But when we say unconditional I mean a *real* unconditional surrender with no strings attached to it; that means for the Germans to lay down their arms and stand by for orders. Furthermore the surrendering must be done by those in command now. Hitler must surrender. Goering and Himmler and Ribbentrop must surrender. The German generals in command in Russia, in Italy, in Norway, in France, in Yugoslavia must surrender. The "Reichsprotektor" in Prague must surrender. We should not accept surrender from anyone who might be brought forward by a "new" German government lest we shall be cheated as we were in 1918.

2. OCCUPATION. The Allies are to completely occupy Germany. I understand that plans are being made whereby the Americans are to occupy southern Germany, the British, western Germany and the Russians eastern Germany including Prussia. Such a division for occupational purposes is, I think, an excellent idea. I must admit that the thought of a Russian police in Berlin appeals to me greatly.

3. COMPLETE DISARMAMENT. The German nation must be completely disarmed, down to the last pistol in the belt of a German policeman. In other words, there should be no German police. An international police or a United Nations police or an international peace police, anything but a German police. By "complete disarmament" I include the destruction of all industries which by any stretch of imagination could easily be turned into war industries. Most certainly this would

create economic hardship for Germany, but the solution of their economic problems which will exist because of our taking measures of security is not our problem. It is Germany's problem. This is one way in which we shall bring home to the German people the fact that they have lost the war. Let no one tell us that we must rebuild German industries lest we forget that Germany very soon will penetrate many European countries economically as the first step towards recreating political power in the world again. It will be up to Germany to give proof by action and not by words of her trustworthiness, before we can relax these conditions. Nobody, therefore, can say how long the occupation, policing, and economic control of Germany will last. It is my guess that it should not last for more than fifty years. During the occupation imports, exports and all factories will be directly controlled.

4. PUNISHMENT OF CRIMINALS. When I say criminals I do not mean war criminals only, I mean all criminals. You have read in papers and books about the incredible atrocities committed by Germans everywhere. Out of my own experience, for instance in Poland, where I was when the Germans invaded, I can tell you that what you read in papers and what you learn out of books is only an infinitesimal fraction of what the Germans have actually done. Let me remind you of the gas chambers in which hundreds of thousands of Jews were murdered; of the mass graves found in Russia with the corpses of hundreds of thousands of Russian civilians in them; of the shooting of innocent men and women in Norway as hostages; of the killing of civilian Frenchmen, ten or fifteen for one German soldier executed by French patriots; of the starving to death of an uncountable number of Greek children; of the concentration camps with their tortures, of raping and looting all over Europe; of enslaving of millions of men and women in German factories and labor camps! I demand that crimes such as these should be punished not because I am revengful—revenge if any is God's—but for two other reasons: first, to save humanity from such criminals, and second, to bring home to prospective criminals as forcefully as possible the fact that crimes do not pay and that the law of man and the law of God eventually catches up with murderers.

Furthermore, so much hatred has been accumulated in Europe against Germany that the European nations would fight anyone who would try to prevent them from taking a rightful revenge. President Roosevelt's suggestion that criminals should be brought back to the countries in which they have committed crimes and be tried according to the laws of the respective countries is a very wise one. I would suggest that perhaps the women of Lidice, the wives of Frenchmen who have been killed, the fathers of girls who have been ruined should form the jury.

5. DIVISION OF GERMANY. Germany should be divided not I think, in twenty or thirty units as has been proposed, but into two parts: Germany and Prussia. In other words, the status ante quo Bismarck

should be reestablished. This would have the advantage of uniting the Catholic German states into one unit and leaving the Protestant Prussia one unit. The last century and this one have seen the unification of smaller national units into bigger ones. This is the historic trend of our times, and we cannot go against it. With all of Germany occupied, her industrial capacity greatly decreased and her people completely disarmed, the division into two units should be sufficient to break Germany as a great power.

6. REPARATIONS AND REHABILITATION. Germany should pay to the limit of her ability for the damage she has done. It goes without saying that she would have to return loot taken from European countries. Wherever this would not be possible, Germany should pay. No doubt, the United Nations, and especially the United States will be asked to support poor Czech or Polish or Yugoslav or Norwegian farmers. Whenever it comes to helping anybody, Americans have always had open hearts and open pocketbooks. I, for one, would certainly advocate that every possible help should be given to these liberated peoples. Yet I can not see why I should buy a new plow for a Czech peasant when a German peasant will be permitted to keep the very plow he stole from this Czech and had his own plow made into bullets with which he killed American soldiers! Therefore, Germany should pay to the limit of her resources; the deficit would then be advanced by the Allies.

7. RE-EDUCATION. Everybody agrees that a program of re-education has to be devised and introduced into Germany. This program cannot be executed by foreigners, but should be left in the hands of Germans under Allied supervision. There are a number of liberal minded Germans in Germany. Of course they are an insignificant little minority. Out of their ranks can be found a number of reliable teachers. Our task must be to make in time a great majority out of this little minority.

I would not try to force any foreign doctrine or love for a foreign form of government upon the Germans, but to slowly guide them to their own great minds, to their own Goethe, Lessing and Bach. I would try to show them that perhaps in times to come this Goethe-Germany could become the true Germany and would then no longer be the Germany of men of "blood and iron," Barbarossa, Frederick the Great, Bismarck, Hitler.

This process of re-education is perhaps, a long one. No matter how long it might take we have to do it. If we fail, all other efforts will have been in vain. If we fail to eliminate militarism in every form in Germany, we shall never be able to eliminate militarism anywhere else. The ultimate goal of all our efforts is to make the world a peaceful, better place to live in. The United Nations now have an opportunity as never before to approximate this goal. If we succeed in

winning the battle after the war, we can hope for a long period of peace, a peace which will have been bought with the lives of millions of the world's finest young men.

8. No peace treaty should be concluded with Germany. The state of armistice should be maintained for an indefinite period of time, until Germany herself will have given proof by deeds and not by promises that she can be admitted to the society of nations. The proof is Germany's—the decision is ours.

The Germans could hasten the end of this state of affairs by purging all pro-militarists, fascists, Pan-Germanists themselves and by endeavouring to make good as much as they can of the incredible damage done to the peoples of the world.